DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 744 JC 840 361

AUTHOR Ostertag, Bruce A.; Baker, Ronald E.
TITLE A Follow-Up Study of Learning Disabled Programs in California Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Jul 84
NOTE 67p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Diagnostic Tests; *Educational Diagnosis; *Handicap Identification; *Learning Disabilities; *Program Descriptions; *Special Programs; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to identify and describe the programs and services offered by California community colleges to meet the needs of learning disabled average (LDA) students. The survey of 106 California community colleges sought information on program characteristics, and on the identification and assessment methods employed by the colleges. Study findings, based on responses from 100% of the colleges, revealed: (1) over 80% of the colleges operated formal programs, while 12% provided informal services for their LDA student population; (2) 65% of the respondents identified themselves as LDA coordinator/specialist, while 29% indicated that they were the Coordinator/Enabler of Handicapped Services; (3) methods of meeting LDA students' educational needs included special classes, tutorial support, counseling, and other auxiliary services; (4) Individual Education Plans were maintained on over 91% of assisted LDA students in formal programs; (5) the average time an identified student received services from a formal LDA program was four semesters for 41% of the students, and two to three semesters for 34% of the students; (6) respondents indicated that 90% or more of the LDA referrals came from (in rank order) faculty, counselors, high schools, the Department of Rehabilitation, parents/relatives, and LDA students themselves. The study report includes comparisons with a similar study conducted in 1982. Appendices include the survey instrument and detailed results. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED245744

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF LEARNING DISABLED PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By
Dr. Bruce A. Ostertag
and
Dr. Ronald E. Baker

July, 1984

Chancellor's Office
California Community College

JC 840 361

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. A. Ostertag

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF LEARNING DISABLED PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Submitted By:

Dr. Bruce Ostertag
Assistant Professor of Special Education
College of Education
c/o California State University, Sacramento
6000 "J" Street
Sacramento, CA 95819

Dr. Ronald E. Baker
Coordinator/Enabler
Handicapped Student Services
c/o Mira Costa College
One Bernard Drive
Oceanside, CA 82054

Submitted To:

Mr. Robert Howard
State Specialist
Specially Funded Programs
c/o California Community College
Chancellor's Office
1107 - 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

July, 1984

ABSTRACT

This is as follow-up report based upon a survey sent to the California Community Colleges regarding programming for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students. This study looked at the current LDA program characteristics, identification and assessment methods employed compared to those reported in the previous Ostertag and Baker (1982) research. One-hundred percent (106 total) of the colleges responded to the survey questions. Over 80 percent of the community colleges operated formal programs while 12 percent provided informal services for their LDA student population; this represented approximately a five percent growth in formal programming as informal programs remained static to the 1982 study results. Additional aspects of the formal programming for LDA students were scrutinized regarding current versus past practices.

A consistency of past and present practices and methodologies existed among community college LDA programs. One of the few areas that represented a change was in standardized test instruments used for LDA identification and assessments; fewer tests were employed and with differing frequencies.

Based upon the models provided by several of the community colleges and current research, recommendations were made for those who wish to implement post-secondary level LDA programs. The recommendations suggested: 1) the use of appropriate, valid and reliable assessments for post-secondary level students; 2) the norming of tests identified by practitioners as apparently appropriate to post-secondary level students; 3) defined services, identification and assessment procedure in accordance with the accepted LDA definition and research findings; 4) consistent data reporting methods, such as a system-wide I.E.P. format, securely and confidentially maintained; and 5) the development of an up-dated handbook for use by practitioners of post-secondary LDA programs.

CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	iii
Introduction	1
Background	1
Need for the Study	2
The Problem.	3
Statement of the Problem	3
Assumptions of the Study	3
Limitations.	4
Methodology.	4
Results.	4
Respondent Characteristics	5
Program Characteristics.	5
Identification and Assessment Tools.	14
Discussion and Recommendations	25
Summary.	
Selected Bibliography.	27
Appendix A - Position Titles of Respondents.	29
Appendix B - Formal LDA Program Sites.	30
Appendix C - Informal LDA Program Sites.	36
Appendix D - Sites Without LDA Services.	38
Appendix E - Follow-up Questionnaire	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table — Page

1. Number and Type of Programs at California Community Colleges for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) Students. . . 6
2. Number of LDA Served by Programs at California Community Colleges 6
3. Means by Which Students are Academically Assisted, as Reported by California Community Colleges with Formal LDA Programs 8
4. Additional Adjustments Implemented to Aid Students in Formal and Informal LDA Programs 9
5. Active Individual Education Programs (IEP) Maintained for Students in Formal LDA Program 10
6. Formal Multidisciplinary Team Conferences Held to Develop LDA Student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) . . . 11
7. Primary Members of Multidisciplinary Team When LDA Students Individualized Education Program (IEP) is Developed. . . . 11
8. Inservice Training Provided for Community College Faculty and Staff Through Formal LDA Program Resources 12
9. Length of Time a Student Receives Services From Formal LDA Programs 13
10. Referral by Individuals or Agencies of Potential Candidates for LDA Programs 14
11. Intake Interviews Conducted with Potential Students for Formal LDA Programs. 15
12. Acceptance of Assessment Results From Other Agencies for Placement of Students into Formal LDA Programs 16
13. Agencies From Which Assessments Results Accepted for Student Placement into Formal LDA Programs 17
14. Formal (Commercially-Available) Assessments Administered to Potential Students for Acceptance into Formal LDA Programs 18
15. Ten Most-Widely Used Tests by Formal LDA Programs for Identification or Assessment Purposes. 19

Table Page

16. Areas in Which Informal Tests are Used to Identify Students for Formal LDA Programs. 20

17. Formal Multidisciplinary Team Conference Held to Determine Student Admission in LDA Programs. 21

18. Primary Members of Multidisciplinary Team When Potential Student Candidates Considered for LDA Programs 22

19. LDA Definition of Achievement-Aptitude Discrepancy and/or Exclusionary Clause Used in Determining Eligibility into Formal LDA Programs. 23

20. Means by Which LDA Definition of Achievement-Aptitude Discrepancy is Measured for Eligibility into Formal LDA Programs 24

21. Position Title of California Community College Respondents to LDA Follow-up Questionnaire 30

22. California Community Colleges with Formal LDA Programs Ranked by LDA Student Population 33

23. California Community Colleges with Formal LDA Programs Ranked by LDA Student Population 37

24. California Community Colleges without Special Services for LDA Students 39

INTRODUCTION

This report contains specific information drawn from a statewide research project conducted by Dr. Bruce A. Ostertag and Dr. Ronald E. Baker during January and February, 1984. The research team was also assisted by Dr. Donald Deshler, Dr. Daryl Mellard, Ms. Laurel Best and Mr. Robert F. Howard in the development, dissemination and description of the project. The study was a follow-up to a descriptive study conducted in Spring, 1982. Comparative answers were sought between these studies regarding California community colleges and services available to those students considered to have a learning disability; these students are termed, "Learning Disabled-Average (LDA)." This report focuses on the following comparative aspects of those studies: 1) formal and/or informal means of identifying and assessing LDA students; 2) the assessment areas measured; 3) personnel involved with LDA students; and 4) service delivery systems.

Following a review of literature pertaining to post-secondary education for the learning disabled, it was discovered that no study had been completed and published addressing the proposed research items. The Chancellor's Office of the California Communtiy Colleges, the above research team, other organizations and authors have published recommended assessment instruments or recommended methods. However, other than the research team's initial descriptive study, no other work has dealt with the specific methods or assessment strategies and instruments; no follow-up research has been conducted. This study meets that need using descriptive statistics, narrative, charts and tables.

Background

Identified adults with specific learning disabilities are a relatively new phenomenon in post-secondary education. Their participation in college is requiring a reevaluation of the types of programs and services offered in all segments of post-secondary education. Dr. Barbara Cordoni (1982) noted there is a minimum of such programming and services nationwide. This is not altogether true in California where the Communtiy Colleges have been providing extensive services for the last seven to eight years for students identified as having specific learning disabilities. The California State Universities and University of California's have also provided services, though on a smaller scale, for the past several years.

The purpose of this follow-up work was to describe research conducted in the California Community Colleges on existing programs and services for adults with learning disabilities and compare the responses with those obtained in a previous study (Ostertag and Baker, 1982).

The definition for Learning Disabled has undergone substantial refinement during the last half-decade in the California Community Colleges. The colleges no longer adhere to the identification and assessment models operating in the K-12 special education system, though post-secondary education does deal with many students who have attended that system. The community college definition of LDA is still in a state of transition. Colleges are now operating LDA programs under the definitional guidelines developed by the California Association of Post-Secondary Educators of the Disabled (CAPED), Learning Disabilities Division, and adopted by the Community College Chancellor's Office:

> "A specific learning disability refers to disorders in which an individual exhibits a significant/severe discrepancy between the current level of developed intellectual abilities and academic performances despite regular instruction and educational opportunity, as currently measured by professionally recognized diagnostic procedures. Academic performance refers to achievement in the following areas: listening comprehension, oral expression, written expression, basic reading skills, reading comprehension, mathematical calculation and reasoning. Specific Learning Disabilities are often due to constitutional, genetic and/or neurological factors and are not primarily due to: visual or auditory sensory deficits, motor handicaps, severe emotional disturbance, environmental or economic disadvantage, cultural/langauge difference, or mental retardation (1982)."

Need for the Study

A study describing the latest state-of-the-art in California community colleges programs for LDA students was necessary for reasons of accountability and program improvement. Inconsistencies in programming throughout the state have led to confusion and, in some few cases, charges of non-compliance with state and Chancellor Office mandates. It was also feasible that programs could be in compliance with the law and yet not be providing

appropriate education for their learning disabled students. A comprehensive description of present programs would provide information which could be beneficial for the post-secondary LDA students. This study could lend itself as a resource for the Chancellor's Office, administrators of LDA programs, specialists working with LDA students, and college instructors of special education. Additionally, the accumulated data could serve as a possible reference point for future studies.

The Problem

The problem of this research was to identify and describe the programming used in California community colleges to meet the needs of students considered LDA. These programs were explored according to the areas of: characteristics, identification, and assessment tools.

Statement of the Problem

More specifically, the problem examined programming for LDA students by determining answers to the following questions:

1. What organization characteristics were evident?
2. How were LDA students identified?
3. What assessment tools were used for identification and diagnostic purposes?
4. Have programs for LDA students changed in the past two years?

Assumptions of the Study

Several basic assumptions formed the basis for the questions of this study. First, there was no official coordinated programming between community college districts in the areas of assessment strategies, content and priorities, and identification procedures for LDA programs. Second, the expertise of specialists working with LDA students was, generally, quite professional, but not all community colleges had specialists available in their programs. Many LDA students were being served by staff unfamiliar with and/or not certified in the area of learning disabilities. Third, though community college LDA programming was not coordinated statewide, there was a commonality of teaching techniques, tools, and administration. This assumption was based upon the belief that specialist-

training through graduate-college coursework stressed somewhat similar instruction in this field. Most specialists of the LDA have been instructed with covergent methods, texts, and assessment tools. Lastly, it was assumed that there have been minimal changes in the California community colleges for LDA student between 1982-84.

Limitations

The following limitations should be taken into account in this study. In all cases, the usual error factors that occur in any research existed, such as inadvertent inaccuracies and misinterpretation of question content by respondents.

1. Personal interviews based upon a written questionnaire were used to collect a representative portion of the data.
2. A mailed questionnaire was used to collect the bulk of data.
3. Other records, documents, and statistics were used to formulate this investigation.
4. The processing of the obtained data.
5. Learning disability theories are relatively new and unproven. The lack of longitudinal studies to support these theories will limit the utility of this research.

Methodology

A questionnaire was developed and field tested through personal interviews. This selected group of college personnel examining the questionnaire indicated an understanding of the questions; therefore no significant item modifications were made.

With the clarity of the questionnaire confirmed, the questionnaire was mailed to all the public California community colleges. In total, 106 community colleges were contacted. The study was conducted during January and February, 1984.

Results

One-hundred-and-six colleges out of the total 106 participated in this study for a return of 100 percent. The Community College Chancellor's Office and CAPED assisted in obtaining the high return by requesting every college to respond.

Respondent Characteristics. Sixty-five percent of the respondents identified themselves as the LDA Coordinator/Specialist. Twenty-nine percent indicated that they were the Coordinator/Enabler of Handicapped Services while the remaining six percent said they were the college psychologist or other faculty. See Appendix A for the position titles of all respondents.

Program Characteristics. Tables 1 and 2 indicate the type and size of programming at California's community colleges for LDA students. Programs were designated as formal or informal. Formal programs were defined as having: 1) an LDA specialists; 2) standard identification procedures for each student; 3) and the option of offering special instruction or classes for LDA students. With these guidelines, 85 of the responding colleges said they had formal programs. This represents about a five percent increase over the 1982 results. Thirteen colleges, the same amount (though with some different colleges) as in the previous study, stated they operated some type of services for LDA students other than a formal program. Only eight of the respondent colleges, almost a five percent decrease, did not officially serve LDA students in any capacity. See Appendix B-D for those specific formal, informal, and nil LDA programs. LDA students are now served in almost 93 percent of California's community college system.

The LDA student population increased by over 2,900 students in the past two years. Formal programs have grown to a population of 10,343, representing a 36 percent increase. Informal programs claim a total of 491 LDA students for a 50 percent increase. In all, the LDA student population has grown from 7,962 to 10,869 students, a 37 percent growth rate in two years.

TABLE 1: Number and Type of Programs at California Community Colleges for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) Students.

Type of Program for LDA Students	1981/82 Number of Colleges Percentage of Colleges	1983/84 Number of Colleges Percentage of Colleges
Formal Program	80 75.4%	85 80.2%
Informal Program	13 12.3%	13 12.3%
No Special Program	13 12.3%	8 7.5%
TOTAL	106 100%	106 100%

TABLE 2: Number of LDA Students Served by Programs at California Community Colleges

Type of Program for LDA Students	1981/82 LDA Population	1983/84 LDA Population[a]	LDA Population Difference
Formal Program	7,631	10,343	+2,712
Informal Program	331	491	+ 166
No Special Program	0	29	+ 29
TOTAL	7,962	10,869	+2,907

[a]Reported to Chancellor's Office Final Claim Form (CCC-SS-3).

Identified LDA students had their educational needs met through a variety of ways. College programs include special classes, tutorial support, counseling and other auxillary services. Table 3 illustrates that means by which LDA students were assisted. Tutorial services were delivered primarily through one-to-one settings by an aide in the LDA program, the LDA specialist, or a peer tutor. Counseling was also handled through a one-to-one setting in academic career and personal areas under the direction of the LDA program or external programs. In two years, there were few significant (.05) changes to meeting the LDA student's educational needs except for a decrease in external counseling support as a group or in-class. There was also a noticeable decrease in the use of peer-tutors as general tutorial supporters.

Additional adjustments implemented to aid students in LDA programs are shown on Table 4. Though changes have occurred in two years, the committment to this type of support is still strong. There has been a significant increase of support to the areas of registration services (+6.5%) and notetaker services (+6.3%). Four areas demonstrate significant decreases in support: time extension to complete course requirements (-13.9%); class schedules modified (-7.3%); course curriculum revised (-7.0%); and learning center availability (-5.4%). Several adjustments still have over a 90 percent committment: diagnostic learning assessments (87.5%) and registration services (96.5%). Those areas in which more than 80 percent of the colleges make additional adjustments include: learning center availability (87.1%); reader services (83.5%); lecture reproduction (82.2%); and notetaker services (81.2%).

TABLE 3: Means by Which Students are Academically Assisted, as Reported by California Community Colleges With Formal LDA Programs.[a]

A. Tutorial Support	One-to-One		In Group		In Class	
	1981/82 Number Percentage[b]	1983/84 Number Percentage[c]	1981/82 Number Percentage[b]	1983/84 Number Percentage[c]	1981/82 Number Percentage[b]	1983/84 Number Percentage[c]
LDA Specialist	59 73.8%	64 75.3%	47 58.8%	51 60.0%	41 51.3%	47 55.3%
Peer Tutor	51 63.8%	48 56.5%	31 38.8%	23 27.1%	16 20.0%	12 14.1%
Aide	68 85.0%	73 85.9%	50 62.5%	56 65.9%	36 45.0%	39 45.9%
Other Faculty	22 27.5%	22 25.9%	12 15.0%	16 18.8%	23 28.8%	26 30.6%
B. Counseling Internal to LDA Programs						
Academic	77 96.3%	78 91.8%	16 20.0%	14 16.5%	13 16.3%	13 15.3%
Personal	70 87.5%	73 85.9%	22 27.5%	20 23.5%	16 20.0%	17 20.0%
Career	72 90.0%	72 84.7%	27 33.8%	22 25.9%	27 33.8%	31 35.5%
C. Counseling External to LDA Program						
Academic	68 85.0%	76 89.4%	16 20.0%	9 10.6%	18 22.5%	11 12.9%
Personal	64 80.0%	71 83.5%	18 22.5%	7 8.2%	25 31.3%	10 11.8%
Career	65 81.3%	65 76.5%	27 33.8%	12 14.1%	40 50.0%	29 34.1%

[a]More than one response permitted.
[b]Based upon 80 respondents.
[c]Based upon 85 respondents.

TABLE 4: Additional Adjustments Implemented to Aid Students in Formal and Informal LDA Programs.[a]

Adjustment	1981/82 Number of Colleges / Percentage of Colleges[b]	1983/84 Number-of Colleges / Percentage of Colleges[c]
Learning Center Available for Remediation Needs	74 92.5%	74 87.1%
Arrangements for Lecture, Comprehension Reproduction	68 85.0%	70 82.2%
Class Schedules Modified to meet related problems	51 63.8%	48 56.5%
Course Curriculum Revised	48 60.0%	45 53.0%
Extend time to complete individual Course Requirements	29 36.3%	19 22.4%
Waive or Extend time to complete Degree Requirements	19 23.8%	23 27.1%
Course Substitutions	6 7.5%	10 11.8%
Auxilliary Support Services:	80 100%	85 100%
1. Reader	64 80.0%	71 83.5%
2. Notetaker Service	60 75.0%	69 81.2%
3. Registration Service	72 90.0%	82 96.5%
4. Diagnostic Learning Assessment	76 95%	83 97.6%
5. Other	63 78.8%	80 94.1%

[a]More than one response permitted.
[b]Based upon 80 respondents.
[c]Based upon 85 respondents.

Individual Education Plans (IEP's) were maintained on over 91 percent of assisted LDA students in formal programs. The number of colleges (78 colleges) which developed IEP's was the same as was indicated in 1982, but because of the increased participation of colleges currently, this figure illustrates a significant (5.6% decrease. When asked if a Multidisciplinary Team was used to develop an LDA student's IEP, approximately 28 percent replied affirmatively, 40 percent did not use teams, and about 29 percent occasionally utilized teams. The overall usage of team-developed IEP's was essentially the same between the original and follow-up study respondents. This also holds true for the primary members who serve on the Multidisciplinary Team; the LDA specialist, LDA student and counselor are still the primary members. See Tables 5, 6 and 7 for the detailed findings.

TABLE 5: Active Individual Education Programs (I.E.P.) Maintained for Students in Formal LDA Program.

Programs Actively Maintained	1981/82 Number of Colleges / Percentage of Colleges	1983/84 Number of Colleges / Percentage of Colleges
Yes	78 97.4%	78 91.8%
No	1 1.3%	3 3.5%
Missing Response	1 1.3%	4 4.7%
Total	80 100%	85 100%

TABLE 6: Formal Multidisciplinary Team Conferences Held to Develop LDA Student's Individualized Education Program (IEP).

Conference Held	1981/82 Number of Colleges / Percentage of Colleges	1983/84 Number of Colleges / Percentage of Colleges
Yes	17 21.3%	24 28.2%
No	32 40.0%	34 40.0%
Sometimes	30 37.5%	25 29.4%
Missing Cases	1 1.3%	2 2.4%
Total	80 100.0%	85 100.0%

TABLE 7: Primary Members of Multidisciplinary Team When LDA Students Individualized Education Program (IEP) is Developed. [a]

Members	1981/82 Frequency	1981/82 Percent [b]	1983/84 Frequency	1983/84 Percent [c]
LDA Specialist	37	86.0%	39	92.9%
Student	36	83.7%	37	88.1%
Counselor	27	62.8%	22	52.4%
Enabler/College Specialist	17	39.5%	21	50.0%
Other Faculty	17	39.5%	12	28.6%
Speech and Language Therapist	14	32.6%	11	26.2%
Parent/Relative	11	25.6%	10	23.8%
Psychologist	6	14.0%	8	19.0%
Social Worker	5	11.6%	6	11.9%
Specialist Aide	0	0.0%	5	4.8%
Department of Rehabilitation Counselor	0	0.0%	2	4.8%
Medical Doctor	1	2.3%	2	4.8%

[a] More than one response permitted.
[b] Based on 43 possible responses per Member.
[c] Based on 42 possible responses per Member.

Inservice training was again provided by the majority of respondents who had formal LDA program resources. The percentages were not significantly different in the follow-up study as 88% of the respondents provided inservice work for other faculty, staff and parents. (Table 8).

TABLE 8: Inservice Training Provided for Community College Faculty and Staff Through Formal LDA Program Resources.

Inservice Training Provided	1981/82 Number of Colleges / Percentage of Colleges	1983/84 Number of Colleges / Percentage of Colleges
Yes	74 92.4%	75 88.3%
No	3 3.8%	7 8.2%
Missing Responses	3 3.8%	3 3.5%
Total	80 100%	85 100%

One of the new areas questioned in the follow-up study concerned the average length of time an identified student received services from a formal LDA program. The average time spent by 41 percent of the LDA students who received services was four semesters. Thirty-four percent of the respondents indicated the average stay was two-to-three semesters in length. Only 11 percent said LDA students received services that exceeded four semesters in total (see Table 9).

TABLE 9: Length of Time a Student Receives Services From Formal LDA Programs

Time	Number of Colleges	Percentages of Colleges [a]
One Semester or Less	1	1.2%
Two	13	15.3%
Three	16	18.8%
Four	35	41.1%
Five	3	3.5%
Six	6	7.1%
Seven Semesters or More	1	1.2%
Other [b]	6	7.1%
Missing Responses	4	4.7%
Total	85	100.0%

[a] Based upon 85 responses
[b] All "Others" indicated that their programs were too new to derive figures.

Identification and Assessment Tools. Several questionnaire items addressed the issue of identification. Respondents indicated that approximately ninety percent or more of the LDA referrals can come from, in rank order: 1) Faculty; 2) Counselors; 3) High Schools; 4) Department of Rehabilitation; 5) Parents/Relatives; and 6) the LDA student themselves. Also, two other referral groups rated fairly high: Social Services Agencies and LDA Students Peers. These results are virtually identical for the original 1982 survey and the 1984 follow-up study (see Table 10).

TABLE 10: Referral by Individuals or Agencies of Potential Candidates for LDA Programs [a]

Agency or Individual	1981/82 Frequency	Percent [b]	1983/84 Frequency	Percent [c]
Faculty	79	98.8%	85	100.0%
High Schools	78	97.5%	84	98.8%
Department of Rehabilitation	78	97.5%	83	97.6%
Counselor	78	97.5%	82	96.5%
Parents/Relatives	76	95.0%	82	96.5%
Self	77	96.3%	75	88.2%
LDA Specialist	57	71.3%	65	76.5%
Peers (of Students)	61	76.3%	63	74.1%
College Placement Agency	39	48.8%	53	62.4%
Social Service Agency	60	75.0%	48	56.5%
Psychologist	46	57.5%	46	54.1%
Law Enforcement Agency	22	27.5%	24	28.2%
Religious Institutions	10	12.5%	6	7.1%
Rehabilitation/State Hospitals	0	0.0%	5	5.9%
Local Colleges	0	0.0%	2	2.4%
Parent Group (CANHC)	0	0.0%	1	1.2%

[a] More than one response possible
[b] Based on 80 possible responses per Agency or Individual
[c] Based on 85 possible responses per Agency or Individual

As part of the initial identification process, in-take interviews were given by over 95 percent of the respondents who deliver formal LDA programs. Two percent of the respondents occasionally held intake interviews and zero respondents answered in the negative. The results were comparable to findings in the original study (see Table 11).

TABLE 11: Intake Interviews Conducted with Potential Students for Formal LDA Programs

Intake Interviews Conducted	1981/82 Number of Colleges / Percentage of Colleges	1983/84 Number of Colleges / Pecentage of Colleges
Yes	75 93.8%	81 95.2%
No	2 2.5%	0 0.0%
Sometimes	3 3.8%	2 2.4%
Missing Responses	0 0.0%	2 2.4%
Total	80 100.0%	85 100.0%

Following the above interviews, eighty-nine percent of the existing formal LDA programs accepted assessment results from other agencies for placement purposes. Table 12 gives the results regarding assessment data acceptance for both the original and follow-up study. The follow-up study also obtained data (Table 13) which identified those agencies from which assessment results were accepted. The two most widely accepted agency assessments were the Department of Rehabilitation (100%) and local high schools (98.5%). The results obtained through private psychologists were also widely accepted (89.4%).

TABLE 12: Acceptance of Assessment Results From Other Agencies for Placement of Students into Formal LDA Programs.

Acceptance of Assessments	1981/82 Number of Colleges Percentage of Colleges	1983/84 Number of Colleges Percentage of Colleges
Yes	70 87.5%	76 89.4%
No	9 11.3%	8 9.4%
Missing Responses	1 1.2%	1 1.2%
Total	80 100.0%	85 100.0%

TABLE 13: Agencies From Which Assessments Results Accepted for Student Placement into Formal LDA Programs.[a]

Agencies/Institutions From Which Assessments Accepted	Number of Colleges[b] / Percentage of Colleges[c]
Department of Rehabilitation	76 100.0%
Local High Schools	75 98.5%
Private Psychologists	68 89.4%
Private Rehabilitation Agencies	36 47.4%
Regional Centers	13 17.1%
Diagnostic Clinics	4 5.3%
State Hospitals/Medical Facilities	4 5.3%
Private Education Facilities	3 3.9%

[a]Based upon the 76 positive responses from those who accept other agencies/ institution assessment results.
[b]More than one response permitted.
[c]Based upon 76 responses.

Standardized assessment were given by 89 percent of all formal LDA programs. These normed, commerically-available tests were administered to potential students an additional seven percent of the time on occasion. Only one percent of the responding colleges did not employ these tests for identification purposes (see Table 14). These figures show a nine percent growth in colleges which administer formal assessments to potential LDA program students; this growth may stem from the almost eight percent drop in colleges which only occasionally gave these tests.

TABLE 14: Formal (Commercially-Available) Assessments Administered to Potential Students for Acceptance into Formal LDA Programs.

Formal Assessments Administered	1981/82 Number of Colleges / Percentage of Colleges	1983/84 Number of Colleges / Percentage of Colleges
Yes	65 81.3%	76 89.4%
No	3 3.8%	1 1.2%
Sometimes	12 15.0%	6 7.1%
Missing Responses	0 0.0%	2 2.3%
Total	80 100.0%	85 100.0%

The ten most widely-used tests by formal LDA programs for identification or assessment purposes appear on Table 15. Only two tests are used by more than half of the LDA programs: the Wide Range Achievement Test (78.8%) and the Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Battery (71.8%). The next three tests were the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (45.9%), Peabody Individual Achievement Test (42.4%), and Weschler Adult

TABLE 15: Ten Most-Widely Used Tests by Formal LDA Programs for Identification or Assessment Purposes. [a]

Test	1981/82 [b] Number of Colleges Percentage of Colleges	1983/84 [b] Number of Colleges Percentages of Colleges
1. Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	70 88.6%	67 78.8%
2. Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery (WJPE)	44 55.7%	61 71.8%
3. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	58 73.4%	39 45.9%
4. Peabody Individual Acheivement Test	58 73.4%	36 42.4%
5. Weschler Adult Intelligence Test-Revised (WAIS-R)	42 53.2%	35 41.2%
6. Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	48 60.8%	29 34.1%
7. Raven-Progressive Matrix	27 34.2%	25 29.4%
8. Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test	31 39.2%	24 28.2%
9. KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	40 50.6%	22 25.9%
10. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	38 48.1%	21 24.7%

[a] Multiple responses permitted
[b] Based upon 80 respondents
[c] Based upon 85 respondents

Intelligence Test-Revised (41.2%). This survey question generated widely-different responses between the original and most recent survey. Except for the Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Battery (which gained in usage), all identified standardized tests dropped in frequency of use by ten to 31 percent.

Informal tests (teacher-made or community college-developed) assessments were given in the initial study by 64 respondents to complement the above testing. The area most frequently assessed through informal test identification purposes in both studies was in the area of written language (81.2%). Table 16 offers the comparison results.

TABLE 16: Areas in Which Informal Tests are Used to Identify Students for Formal LDA Programs [a]

Informal Test Areas	1981/82 [b] Number of Colleges / Percentages of Colleges	1983/84 [c] Number of Colleges / Percentages of Colleges
Written Language	55 68.8%	69 81.2%
Reading	32 40.0%	41 48.2%
Specific Learning Abilities/ Modalities	27 33.8%	40 47.1%
Arithmetic	30 37.5%	31 36.5%
Spoken Language	24 28.2%	29 34.1%
Over-all Achievement	24 28.2%	29 34.1%
Classroom Behavior	27 33.8%	28 32.9%
Spelling	27 33.8%	26 30.6%
Intellectual Performance/ Adaptive Behavior	17 21.3%	21 24.7%

[a] Multiple responses permitted
[b] Based upon 80 responses
[c] Based upon 85 responses

The majority (77%) of responding formal LDA programs did not require multidisciplinary team conferences held when determining admission into those programs. However, 48 percent of the programs sometimes used such conferences for placement purposes. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents never used teams for those reasons. Only 20 percent of the respondents admitted students to formal LDA programs based upon multidisciplinary team decisions. Like results were obtained from both studies (see Table 17).

TABLE 17: Formal Multidisciplinary Team Conference Held to Determine Student Admission in LDA Programs.

Conference Held	1981/82 Number of Colleges Percentage of Colleges	1983.84 Number of Colleges Percentage of Colleges
Yes	16 20.0%	17 20.0%
No	32 40.0%	25 29.4%
Sometimes	30 37.5%	41 48.2%
Missing Response	2 2.5%	2 2.4%
Total	80 100.0%	85 100.0%

When teams were used, the primary members were the LDA specialist, enabler/college specialist or school counselor (see Table 18). The participation of said members has dropped in frequency (up to 18%) since the original survey was administered. Only three categories of participants have increased: college administrator (8.6%), medical doctor/health services (5.2%), and rehabilitation counselor (3.4%).

TABLE 18: Primary Members of Multidisciplinary Team When Potential Student Candidates Considered for LDA Programs. [a]

Members	1981/82 Frequency	Percent [b]	1983/84 Frequency	Percent [c]
LDA Specialist	35	83.3%	43	74.1%
Enabler/College Specialist	22	52.4%	30	51.7%
Counselor	28	66.7%	28	48.3%
Student	24	57.1%	23	39.7%
Speech and Language Therapist	17	40.5%	14	24.1%
Other Faculty	13	31.0%	13	22.4%
Psychologist	13	31.0%	12	20.7%
Parent/Relative	12	28.6%	11	19.0%
Administrator	0	0.0%	5	8.6%
Social Worker	4	9.5%	4	6.9%
Medical Doctor/Health Services	1	2.4%	3	5.2%
Department of Rehabilitation Counselor	0	0.0%	2	3.4%

[a] More than one response permitted.
[b] Based upon 42 possible responses per Team Member.
[c] Based upon 58 possible responses per Team Member.

The last identification area surveyed was unique to the follow-up questionnaire. Two questions addressed the usage of the accepted LDA definition of achievement-aptitude discrepancy and/or exclusionary clause in determining eligibility into formal LDA programs. Table 19 indicates that 81 percent of the programs always apply the LDA definition standards regarding achievement-apptitude while only 49 percent apply the exclusionary clause. An additional 14 percent sometimes employ the discrepancy clause.

TABLE 19: LDA Definition of Achievement-Aptitude Discrepancy and/or Exclusionary Clause Used in Determining Eligibility into Formal LDA Programs.

Response	Achievement-Aptitude Discrepancy Used	Exclusionary Clause Used
Yes	69 81.2%	42 49.4%
No	4 4.7%	9 10.6%
Sometimes	12 14.1%	25 29.4%
Missing Responses	0 0.0%	9 10.6%
Total	85 100.0%	85 100.0%

The means by which the LDA definition of achievement-aptitude discrepancy is measured for eligibility into formal LDA programs appears in Table 20. Clinical judgment was by far the most frequently used means of measuring a discrepancy at almost 77 percent. Forty-seven percent of the respondents also used a standard error of criterion measurement while 19 percent employed some type of formula.

TABLE 20: Means by Which LDA Definition of Achievement-Aptitude Discrepancy is Measured for Eligibility into Formal LDA Programs.[a]

Means of Measurement	Number of Colleges[b] / Percentage of Colleges[c]
Clinical Judgement	62 76.5%
Standard Error of Measurement Criterion	38 46.9%
Formula(s)	15 18.5%
Other	9 1.1%
Incidence Level of Population Criterion	4 0.9%

[a]Based upon 81 responses from those who employ the LDA Definition of Achievement-Aptitude Discrepancy for determining eligibility.
[b]More than one response permitted.
[c]Based upon 81 responses.

Discussion

The number of students served through LDA programs in California's community colleges has grown significantly in the past five years. In the 106 college system, only eight schools do not offer any special services for LDA students: and out of those eight colleges, two have claimed LDA students for Chancellor Office reports. Other than the significant growth factor, the community colleges are serving their LDA student population in much the same manner as was reported (Ostertag and Baker, 1982) two years ago. The implementation and organization of LDA programs evidences diversity to meet local area needs, yet show a consistency throughout the system. Most colleges still provide similar means for the identification and diagnosis of potential LDA students. This is also true in terms of using intake interviews, referring procedures and agencies, and a basic agreement as to the primary assessment tools employed. Programs and support services also demonstrate a consistency from college to college. Support services and instruction are still comprised mainly of teaching, tutoring and counseling by LDA specialists and aides. Also available are learning centers, registration services, readers, notetakers and/or equipment loan.

The specific tests used for assessment purposes and their frequency of usage have changed. Only two assessments are now used by the majority of the respondents: the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) and the Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Batters (WJPE). These tests are being used to identify learning disabilities through an achievement aptitude discrepancy. Other than the WJPE, all other assessments have dropped in the frequency of their use. A continuing pilot study being conducted through the auspices of the California Community College Chancellor's Office, emphasizing the use of technically-adequate, normed and age-appropriate tests, may be responsible for the above changes.

Based upon the follow-up survey results, the following recommendations are suggested for community colleges that offer services for LDA students: 1) usage of appropriate, valid and reliable assessment instruments for post-secondary level students; 2) participation in efforts to norm tests

identified by practitioners as apparently appropriate to post-secondary level students; 3) implementation of a defined services identification and assessment procedure in accordance with the accepted LDA definition and research findings; 4) consistent data-reporting methods, such as a system-wide IEP format, securely and confidentially maintained; and 5) development of an up-dated handbook for the practioners of LDA programs.

The community college system is facing many of the same problems confronting the K-12th public school system. Funding reductions, demands for accountability, assessment and delivery practice appropriateness, identification of LD students versus low achievers, and the basic question of what constitutes a "true" learning disability exists for both systems. These above questions must be addressed, but not to the exclusion of those LD students in need of special services. The California community college system is meeting a recognized need in their attempt to deliver appropriate services to LDA students.

Secondary teachers who work with LD students should explore the educational opportunities available to their students following graduation. The advantages of attending college should be taught in terms of furthering general and employability skills. The California community colleges are affording LD students a unique chance to pursue an Associate of Arts (AA) degree, obtain a vocational certificate and/or training, prepare for transfer work to a four-year college, or simply take courses in an area of interest or need. Formal and informal services are available to help them without any additional cost other than standard California community college fees. The need exists for the development of post-secondary programs for the LD student; the California community colleges are demonstrating a working model transferrable to other areas.

Selected Bibliography

Alley, G. and Deshler, D. Teaching the learning disabled adolescent: strategies and methods. Denver, Colorado: Love Publishing, 1979.

Barbaro, F. "The learning disabled college student: some considerations in setting objectives." Journal of learning disabilities. Vol. 15, No. 10, pp. 599-603, December, 1982.

California Association for Post-Secondary Educators of the Disabled. 1982. Unpublished report. California Communtiy College Chancellor's Office. June, 1982.

California Community College Chancellor's Office. Learning disabilities handbook. Sacramento, California, 1980.

Clark, F. L. (ed.) "Major research findings of the University of Kansas institute for research in learning disabilities." Institute for research in learning disabilities research report No. 31. October, 1981.

Compton, C. A guide to 65 tests for special education. Belmont, California: Fearon Education/Pitman Learning, Inc. 1980.

Cordoni, B. K. "Post-secondary education: where do we go from here?" Journal of learning disabilities Vol. 15, No., 5, p. 265. May, 1982.

Cordino, B. K. "Personal adjustment: the psychosocial aspects of learning disabilities." In M. R. Schmidt and H. Z. Spradel (Eds.), New directions for student services: helping the learning disabled student. California: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Callinan, D. and Epstein, M. H. Special education for adolescents. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1979.

Lewis, R. B. "Learning disabilities and reading: instructional recommendations from current research." Exceptional children. Volume 50, No. 3, pp. 230-240, November, 1983.

Mann, L., Goodman, L. and Wiederholt, P. H. Teaching the learning disabled adolescent. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

McLoughlin, J. A. and Lewis, R. B. Assessing special students. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1981.

Mellard, D., Cooley, S., Poggio, J., and Deshler, D. A comprehensive analysis of four discrepancy methods (Research Monograph No. 15). Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities, 1983.

Ostertag, B. A. and Baker, R. E. "Learning disabled programs in California community colleges." Journal of learning disabilities. Vol. 15, No. 9, pp. 535-538. November, 1982.

Ostertag, B. A. and Baker, R. E. Report of the California community college learning disabled programs. Sacramento, CA: Community College Chancellor's Office, 1982.

Ostertag, B. A. and Schnorr, J. M. "Reading instruction in secondary learning disabled programs." Academic Therapy 17:2, pp. 163-169. November, 1981.

Ostertag, B. A. and Baker, R. E. An analysis of assessment instruments in use by the California community colleges to identify and assess students with special learning disabilities. Sacramento, CA: Community College Chancellor's Office, 1983.

Reynolds, C. R., Gutkin, T. B., Elliot, S. N., and Witt, J. C. School psychology: essentials of theory and practice. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1984.

Reynolds, C. R. and Willson, V. L. Another look at aptitude-achievment discrepancies in the evaluation of learning disabilities. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New Orleans, April, 1984.

Rustigan, C. J. "Characteristics of learning disabled adults." Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Sacramento, Fall, 1983.

Skyer, R. and Skyer, G. What do you do after high school? Rockaway Park, New York: Skyer Consultation Center, Inc., 1984.

Swan, R. J. "A counseling model for promoting academic success of learning disabled students at the university level." Unpublished paper. California State University, Long Beach. February, 1982.

Swanson, H. L. and Watson, B. L. Educational and psychological assessment of exceptional children. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1982.

Vogel, S. A. "On developing LD college programs." Journal of learning disabilities. Vol. 15, No. 9, pp. 518-528, November, 1982.

Weller, C. and Strawser, S. "Detecting learning disabilities in the college-age student." Learning disability quarterly. Volume 3, Spring, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E. and Algozzine, R. "Prespectives on assessment of learning disabled student." Learning disability quarterly. Volume 2, Fall, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J. E. and Algozzine, R. "Current practices in making psychoeducational decisions about learning disabled students." In Senf, G. M. and Torgensen, J. K. (Eds.), Annual review of learning disabilities. Reston, VA.: Council for Exceptional Children Press, 1983.

Appendix A

Position Titles of Respondents

TABLE 21: Position Title of California Community College Respondents to LDA Follow-up Questionnaire

Title	Number of Respondents by Type of Program			
	Formal	Informal	None	Total
LDA Specialist	31	1	0	32
LDA Coordinator	35	0	2	37
Handicapped Program Coordinator	17	11	3	31
Psychologist	0	1	0	1
Other Faculty	2	0	3	5
Total	85	13	8	106

Appendix B

California Community Colleges with Formal LDA Programs

TABLE 22: California Community Colleges with Formal LDA Programs Ranked by LDA Student Population [a]

Colleges	Reported LDA Students Served[b]
1. San Francisco City	724
2. Chaffey	469
3. Santa Ana	440
4. Butte	410
5. Sierra	349
6. Chabot	332
7. De Anza	279
8. Pasadena	263
9. College of the Redwoods	256
10. Fresno City	241
11. Ventura	229
12. Cabrillo	221
13. Cypress	191
14. Bakersfield	184
15. San Joaquin Delta	182
16. El Camino	181
17. Cuesta	173
18. Long Beach City	160
19. Fullerton	148
20. Orange Coast	139
21. Antelope Valley	139
22. San Jose City	139
23. Santa Rosa	138
24. College of the Sequoias	136
25. Santa Barbara City	130
26. San Diego City	129
27. Yuba	128
28. Los Angeles Pierce	125
29. Napa	122
30. College of Marin	120
31. Gavilan	111
32. Santa Monica City	110
33. Alameda	109
34. Oxnard	107
35. Skyline	103
36. Mount San Antonio	101
37. Southwestern	99
38. Modesto	98
39. Cerro Cosa	97
40. Contra Costa	92
41. Riverside City	91
42. Grossmont	90
43. Allan Hancock	89
44. Compton	89

Colleges	Reported LDA Students Served
(Continued)	
45. Diablo Valley	89
46. Saddleback	86
47. Los Angeles Mission	86
48. San Diego Mesa	83
49. Canada	80
50. Cosumnes River[d]	78
51. San Bernardino Valley	77
52. Glendale	74
53. Laney[c]	72
54. Los Medanos	70
55. Evergreen	67
56. Moorpark	66
57. Lake Tahoe	65
58. Merritt	65
59. Cerritos	61
60. College of the Canyons	59
61 San Mateo	57
62. Monterey Peninsula	54
63. Los Angeles City	49
64. Citrus	47
65. West Valley	47
66. Coastline	46
67. Rio Hondo	45
68. Shasta	42
69. Imperial Valley	41
70. Palomar	40
71. Crofton Hills	39
72. Porterville[d]	36
73. Mount San Jacinto	36
74. Los Angeles Harbor	36
75. Mission	36
76. Mendocino	32
77. Lassen	31
78. Indian Valley	30
79. Victor Valley[c]	30
80. Hartnell[c]	27
81. Solano[c]	23
82. College of the Desert	23
83. Columbia	23
84. College of the Siskiyous	21
85. Mira Costa[c]	14
Total	10,869 LDA Students

[a] Formal Programs are defined as having:
(1) an LDA Specialist;
(2) standard identification procedures for each student;
(3) and the option of offering special instruction or classes for LDA students.

[b] Reported to Chancellor's Office Final Claim Form (CCC-SS-3).

[c] Previously claimed to have an Informal LDA Program on a 1981-82 Chancellor's Office Report

[d] Previously claimed not to have any services for LDA students on a 1981-82 Chancellor's Office Report.

Appendix C

California Community Colleges with Informal LDA Programs

TABLE 23: California Community Colleges with Informal LDA Programs Ranked By LDA Student Population [a]

Colleges	Reported LDA Students Served
1. Foothill [d]	222
2. American River [e]	60
3. Kings River [e]	56
4. West Hills	48
5. Los Angeles Valley	28
6. Feather River	19
7. Ohlone	18
8. East Los Angeles [d]	13
9. West Los Angeles [d]	13
10. Golden West	10
11. San Diego Miramar [e]	6
12. Merced [e]	4
13. Taft [ce]	0
TOTAL	497 LDA Students

[a] Some type of service other than Formal Programming offered for LDA students
[b] Reported to Chancellor's Office Final Claim Form (CCC-SS-3).
[c] New program. Figures not yet available
[d] Previously claimed to have a Formal LDA Program on a 1981-82 Chancellor's Office Report.
[e] Previously claimed not to have any services for LDA students on a 1981-82 Chancellor's Office Report.

Appendix D

California Community Colleges
Without Services for LDA Students

TABLE 24: California Community Colleges Without Special Services for LDA Students [a]

College	Reported LA Students Served [b]
1. Los Angeles Southwest [c]	15
2. Los Angeles Trade-Technical [cd]	14
3. San Diego Evening	0
4. Vista [d]	0
5. Cuyamaca [e]	0
6. Barstow	0
7. Sacramento City	0
8. Palo Verde	0
TOTAL	29 LDA Students

[a] No special services provided for LDA students.
[b] Reported to Chancellor's Office Final Claim Form (CCC-SS-3).
[c] Two campuses claimed LDA students served in some capacity even though they reported no special services available.
[d] Previously claimed to have an Informal LDA Program on a 1981-82 Chancellor's Office Report.
[e] Previously claimed to have a Formal LDA Program on a 1981-82 Chancellor's Office Report.

Appendix E

Follow-up Questionnaire

COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE
LEARNING DISABLED AVERAGE (LDA): FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

Code No. _____

41

Please respond to all items (based upon fiscal year 83-84 unless otherwise specified)

1) Title of Respondent (Please check the one that best applies):

1. /__/ Learning Disability Specialist (Instructor)
2. /__/ Learning Disability Specialist (Coordinator, LD Program)
3. /__/ Enabler/Coordinator/College Specialist (Total Handiapped Services)
4. /__/ Psychologist
5. /__/ Counselor
6. /__/ Aide
7. /__/ Other Faculty (identify)_____

2) Type of LDA Program

1. /__/ Formal (Special Instruction, Standard Identification Procedures, LDA Specialist, Other Services)
2. /__/ Informal (Other Services)
3. /__/ None (No Services Available)

3) A. Indicate the NUMBER of LDA claimed served for the SS3, Final Direct Cost Report, due 7/15/83, for the Chancellor's Office. /____/

B. Indicate the NUMBER of your LDA students who were also served in the K-12 system as LDA. /____/

4) Indicate the NUMBER of potential LDA students on your campus who are not receiving services. /____/

If you are not serving any LDA students, please stop here and return the questionnaire in the stamped, addressed envelope. Otherwise, please continue.

5) How is a student initially referred as a possible candidate for the LDA program? Please check any of the below which are appropriate.

1. /__/ Faculty
2. /__/ Counselor
3. /__/ LDA Specialist
4. /__/ Psychologist
5. /__/ Parents/Relatives
6. /__/ High Schools
7. /__/ Law Enforcement Agencies
8. /__/ Department of Rehabilitation
9. /__/ Social Service Agency
10. /__/ Religious Institutions
11. /__/ Peers (of student)
12. /__/ College Placement Exam
13. /__/ Self
14. /__/ Other (describe)_____

6) Are Formal Assessments administered by your college LDA program to potential students?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No 3. /__/ Sometimes

7) Do you use assessment results from referring agencies for student placement purposes into your program?

1. ☐ Yes 2. ☐ No

If you responded "Yes," please indicate those agencies:

1. ☐ Department of Rehabilitation
2. ☐ Local High Schools
3. ☐ Private Psychologists
4. ☐ Private Rehabilitation Agencies
5. ☐ Other Agency (Please List)_____
6. ☐ Other Agency (Please List)_____
7. ☐ Other Agency (Please List)_____

8) Are Formal Multidisciplinary Team Conferences held to determine student admission to your LDA Program?

1. ☐ Yes 2. ☐ No 3. ☐ Sometimes

If you responded "Yes," please indicate the Primary members and numbers of each who belong to the team. (Example: 7. [2] counselor).

1. ☐ Student
2. ☐ Parent/Relative
3. ☐ Psychologist
4. ☐ LDA Specialist
5. ☐ Enabler/College Specialist
6. ☐ Speech and Language Therapist
7. ☐ Counselor
8. ☐ Social Worker
9. ☐ Medical Doctor
10. ☐ Other Faculty
11. ☐ Other (describe)_____
12. ☐ Other (describe)_____

9) Is an achievement-aptitude discrepancy a required component for determining LDA eligibility for your program?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No 3. /__/ Sometimes

If you responded "Yes," or "Sometimes," please indicate how that discrepancy is measured:

1. /__/ Clinical Judgement.
2. /__/ Standard Error of Measurement Criterion.
3. /__/ Incidence Level of Population Criterion.
4. /__/ Formula (Identify)_____
   _____
5. /__/ Other (Identify)_____
   _____

10) Is the "Exclusionary Clause" of the LDA definition a component for determining eligibility for your program?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No 3. /__/ Sometimes

If you responded "Yes" or "Sometimes," please indicate what <u>one</u> to <u>two</u> characteristics/behaviors best determine: a) environmental disadvantage; b) cultural differences; c) mental retardation; d) emotional disturbance; and/or e) motor handicaps and would exclude a student from eligibility for LDA services?

a. Environmental Disadvantage
   1. _____
   2. _____

b. Cultural Differences
   1. _____
   2. _____

c. Mental Retardation
   1. _____
   2. _____

c. Emotional Disturbance
   1. _____
   2. _____

e. Motor Handicaps
   1. _____
   2. _____

11) Are Formal Multidisciplinary Team Conferences held to determine student Individualized Education Programs (I.E.P.'s)?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No 3. /__/ Sometimes

If you responded "Yes," please indicate the Primary members and numbers of each who belong to the team (Example: 3. /1/ Psychologist)

1. /__/ Student
2. /__/ Parent/Relative
3. /__/ Psychologist
4. /__/ LDA Specialist
5. /__/ Enabler
6. /__/ Speech and Language Therapist
7. /__/ Counselor
8. /__/ Social Worker
9. /__/ Medical Doctor
10. /__/ Other Faculty
11. /__/ Other (describe)_____
12. /__/ Other (describe)_____

12) Do you maintain an active Individualized Education Program (IEP) for all students receiving services in your LDA program?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No

13) In what ways does your program academically assist LDA students? Please check any of the below which apply.

A. TUTORIAL SUPPORT:	One-to-One	In Groups	In Class
1. LDA Specialist			
2. Peer-Adult			
3. Aide			
4. Other Faculty			

B. COUNSELING INTERNAL TO THE LDA PROGRAM:	One-to-One	In Group	In Class
1. Academic			
2. Personal			
3. Career			

13) Continued

C. COUNSELING EXTERNAL TO THE LDA PROGRAM:	One-to-One	In Group	In Class
1. Academic			
2. Personal			
3. Career			

14) Indicate any of the below additional adjustments implemented by your program/college to aid the LDA:

1. /_____/ Length of time permitted to complete degree requirements waived or extended.
2. /_____/ Length of time permitted to complete individual course requirements extended.
3. /_____/ Substitutions permitted in course requirements (Example: substituting special remedial course for Introductory English).
4. /_____/ Auxiliary support services provided for students to assist in keeping up with educational demands.

   Check those support services you provide:

   a. /__/ Reader Services
   b. /__/ Notetaker Services
   c. /__/ Registration Assistance
   d. /__/ Diagnostic Learning Assessment
   e. /__/ Other (describe)_____
   f. /__/ Other (describe)_____
   g. /__/ Other (describe)_____

5. /_____/ Required course curriculum revised (Example: Eliminating term paper in favor of taped project). Identify_____
6. /_____/ Arrangements available for notetakers or other methods of reproducing lecture texts. Identify_____
7. /_____/ Learning Center available to provide appropriate remediation for students in reading, math, study skills, etc.
8. /_____/ Classes scheduled to meet problems related to physical or emotional disability, or other special needs.

46

14) Continued

9. /_____/ Other (identify)_____

15) Do you provide in-service training for college faculty and staff?

1. /_/ Yes 2. /_/ No

16) What is the average length of time a student receives services through your LDA Program?

1. /_/ One semester or less
2. /_/ Two semesters
3. /_/ Three semesters
4. /_/ Four semesters
5. /_/ Five semesters
6. /_/ Six semesters
7. /_/ Seven semesters
8. /_/ Other (describe)_____

17) Do you conduct an Intake Interview with prospective students for the LDA program?

1. /_/ Yes 2. /_/ No 3. /_/ Sometimes

18) Check any of the below areas in which Informal Tests (Teacher-made or College-developed) are used to identify LDA students.

1. /_/ Over-all Achievement
2. /_/ Classroom Behavior
3. /_/ Reading
4. /_/ Spoken Language
5. /_/ Written Language
6. /_/ Intellectual Performance/Adaptive Behavior
7. /_/ Specific Learning Abilities/Modalities
8. /_/ Arithmetic
9. /_/ Spelling
10. /_/ Other (identify)_____

19) Please list the major Formal Tests (commercially-developed) used regularly to identify and assess LDA students. Check the appropriate "PURPOSE" and "EVALUATOR" for each test listed.

PURPOSE												TESTS	EVALUATOR						
Achievement	Intellectual Performance	Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Vocational	Arithmetic	Reading	Spoken Language	Written Language	Other		LDA Specialist	Psychologist	Speech Pathologist	Faculty	Counselor	Aide	Other
												1.							
												2.							
												3.							
												4.							
												5.							
												6.							
												7.							

19) Continued

PURPOSE												TESTS	EVALUATOR						
Achievement	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Vocational	Arithmetic	Reading	Spoken Language	Written Language	Other			LDA Specialist	Psychologist	Speech Pathologist	Faculty	Counselor	Aide	Other
												8.							
												9.							
												10.							
												11.							
												12.							
												13.							
												14.							
												15.							

19) Continued

PURPOSE													EVALUATOR							
Achievement	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Vocational	Arithmetic	Reading	Spoken Language	Written Language	Other	TESTS		LDA Specialist	Psychologist	Speech Pathologist	Faculty	Counselor	Aide	Other
											16.								
											17.								
											18.								
											19.								
											20.								

20) Please list any additional comments: _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IMMEDIATELY IN THE ACCOMPANYING, STAMPED ENVELOPE.

Dr. Bruce A. Ostertag
Dr. Ronald E. Baker

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges AUG 3 1984